

*h v*

<b>Notice of Allowability</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/676,393	STEENKISTE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael La Villa	1775	

-- **The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**  
All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to amendment filed on 4 April 2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-6 and 8-20.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 01 October 2003 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some\*   c) ☐ None   of the:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  - \* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  
**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
  - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached
    - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li><li>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li><li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),<br/>Paper No./Mail Date _____</li><li>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit<br/>of Biological Material</li></ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li><li>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),<br/>Paper No./Mail Date _____</li><li>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment</li><li>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance</li><li>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</li></ol> |
|--|--|

*Michael E. La Villa*  
**MICHAEL E. LAVILLA PH.D.**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*h*

### **REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

1. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
2. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are allowed.
3. Applicant's amendments are satisfactory for overcoming the section 112, second paragraph and section 102 rejections over van Steenkiste, Chakraborty, and Goto of the Office Action mailed on 3 January 2005.
4. With respect to the rejections over van Chakraborty and Goto, applicant has amended Claim 1 to provide for a maximum contact resistance. Neither of these references teaches or suggests any particular contact resistance, including the claimed contact resistances. Moreover, the references do not teach or suggest forming electrical connectors as claimed. Therefore, there is no basis for expecting the claimed contact resistances to be inherently obtained or for providing motivation to obtain the claimed contact resistances.
5. With respect to the rejection over van Steenkiste, applicant has traversed on the grounds that van Steenkiste does not teach a discontinuous coating as claimed. Applicant's argument is persuasive. Van Steenkiste teaches that the coating layer is to be "cohesive". See Claim 1, line 3 in van Steenkiste. Moreover, applicant explains at page 8, lines 5-20 of the Specification that various parameters must be changed as compared to van Steenkiste in order to obtain the claimed discontinuous coating. Particularly, applicant moves the substrate with respect to the nozzle, which movement is not disclosed in van Steenkiste. Hence, van Steenkiste cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed articles.

The claimed discontinuous layer of the claimed contact resistance cannot be shown to be inherently achieved or motivated by van Steenkiste. Van Steenkiste does not teach or suggest forming electrical connectors.

6. The following comment clarifies a point made in the rejection over Goto in the earlier Office Action of 3 January 2005. The claimed coating is characterized as having claimed second material particles that are "embedded on" the surface of the claimed first material. In view of applicant's discussion in the Specification at page 6, line 29 through page 7, line 3 and at page 9, lines 29 and 30, this limitation is considered to require penetration of the first material surface by the second material particles in order to obtain an embedded configuration.

### **CONCLUSION**


7. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael La Villa whose telephone number is (571) 272-1539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.
9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1775

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael La Villa  
27 June 2005



MICHAEL E. LAVILLA PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER